



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/676,800	09/29/2000	Johan Kiessling	026125-067	2953

21839 7590 02/02/2004

BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS L L P  
POST OFFICE BOX 1404  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

CORSARO, NICK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2684	

DATE MAILED: 02/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/676,800

Applicant(s)

KIESSLING ET AL.

Examiner

Nick Corsaro

Art Unit

2684

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-23 and 26-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 24 and 25 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

## **RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT**

### **Response to Arguments**

1. Applicant's arguments, see amendment, filed 11/22/2003, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 18-34 under USC 103(c) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Arent et al. (6,108,724).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 18-22, 24, 28, 30 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Proust et al. (6,216,014) in view of Arent et al. (6,018,724).

Consider claim 18, Proust discloses a portable communication apparatus (see col. 1 lines 8-23, and col. 10 lines 30-52). Proust discloses a man-machine interface (see col. 10 lines 60-67). Proust discloses a controller (6, figure 1); an operating system (see col. 1 lines 44-57, col. 3 lines 54-67, col. 4 lines 1-16, col. 10 lines 30-52, col. 11 lines 12-33, and col. 11 lines 47-67, where Proust is discussing a mobile phone with a SIM card, the SIM card having the instructions and memories to operate the phone, therefore, the SIM is the operating system). Proust discloses a local storage device for storing a first application, wherein the man-machine interface is adapted to provide interaction between a user of the portable communication apparatus and the first application when executed by the controller and the operating system (see col. 2 lines 17-30,

Art Unit: 2684

col. 5 lines 10-22, col. 10 lines 35-67, and col. 11 lines 48-67, where Proust discusses accessing local and remote applications by a process in the SIM and where the SIM operates the phone display for phone and short message service operation). Proust discloses a wireless interface for connecting the portable communication apparatus to a remote device, wherein the man-machine interface is also adapted to provide interaction between the user and a second application originating from the remote device (see col. 2 lines 12-30, col. 2 lines 49-67, col. 5 lines 10-22, col. 10 lines 30-67, and col. 11 lines 48-67, where Proust is discussing a user using the phone for local and remote applications such as payments or other, therefore, interaction via the interface of the device). Proust discloses a secure resource which is only accessible from the operating system (see col. 10 lines 35-55, col. 14 lines 10-31, col. 14 lines 62-67, col. 15 lines 1-4, col. 16 lines 3-6, and col. 23 lines 9-21, col. 5 lines 63-67, and col. 1-11, where the applicant's specification, page 2 lines 25-30, defines secure resources as information stored on the SIM, and Proust is discussing the SIM card includes authorization parameters and data files only accessible by the SIM or an application that is authorized by the SIM to access via the SIM). Proust discloses only the operating system is adapted to provide a security indicator the security indicator representing a secure connection between the secure resource and one of the first and second applications currently using the man-machine interface (see col. 13 lines 18-67, col. 14 lines 1-36, col. 12 lines 30-39, and col. 12 lines 39-45, where Proust discusses an authenticating process taking place that includes security indicators and a report on the authentication of local and remote applications, where one of the remote applications can be the cellular system (GSM) application).

Proust does not specifically disclose the system is adapted to provide a security indicator through the man-machine interface. Arent teaches providing a security indicator through the man-machine interface (see col. 4 lines 5-30 and col. 3 lines 5-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Proust, and provide a security indicator through the man-machine interface, as taught by Arent, thereby alerting the user to the security of a transaction to ease the user uncertainty, as discussed by Arent, (col. 1 lines 16-50).

Consider claim 19, Proust discloses the portable communication apparatus. Proust further discloses a security indicator that indicates types and access privileges of and performs and authentication process that involves a cryptogram to authenticate the applications currently using the man-machine interface (see col. 2 lines 3-11, col. 14 lines 10-20, col. 13 lines 18-55, and col. 12 lines 39-67).

Proust does not specifically disclose the security indicator indicates one of a type, origin, and certificate of one of the first and second applications. Arent teaches the security indicator indicates one of a type, origin, and certificate of one of the first and second applications (see col. 3 lines 6-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Proust, and have the security indicator indicates one of a type, origin, and certificate of one of the first and second applications, as taught by Arent, thus alerting the user to the security of a transaction to ease the user uncertainty, as discussed by Arent, (col. 1 lines 16-50).

Consider claim 20, Proust discloses a security indicator (see col. 4 lines 10-16 and col. 13 lines 18-55).

Proust does not specifically disclose the security indicator is presented on a display of the portable communication apparatus. Arent teaches the security indicator is presented on a display of the portable communication apparatus (see col. 5 lines 10-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Proust, and have the security indicator be presented on a display of the portable communication apparatus, as taught by Arent, thereby alerting the user to the security of a transaction to ease the user uncertainty, as discussed by Arent, (col. 1 lines 16-50).

Consider claim 21, Proust discloses a security indicator (see col. 4 lines 10-16 and col. 13 lines 18-55).

Proust does not specifically disclose the security indicator comprises at least one predetermined icon. Arent teaches the security indicator the security indicator comprises at least one predetermined icon (see col. 5 lines 10-43 and col. 3 lines 5-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Proust, and have the security indicator comprises at least one predetermined icon, as taught by Arent, thereby alerting the user to the security of a transaction to ease the user uncertainty, as discussed by Arent, (col. 1 lines 16-50).

Consider claim 22, Proust discloses a security indicator (see col. 4 lines 10-16 and col. 13 lines 18-55).

Proust does not specifically disclose the security indicator comprises a predetermined text message. Arent teaches the security indicator comprises a predetermined text message (see col. 5 lines 10-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Proust, and have the security indicator comprise a

Art Unit: 2684

predetermined text message, as taught by Arent, thereby alerting the user to the security of a transaction to ease the user uncertainty, as discussed by Arent, (col. 1 lines 16-50).

Consider claim 28, Proust discloses a security indicator (see col. 4 lines 10-16 and col. 13 lines 18-55).

Proust does not specifically disclose the security indicator comprises an audible signal through the man-machine interface. Arent teaches the security indicator comprises an audible signal through the man-machine interface. (see col. 7 lines 10-15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Proust, and have the security indicator comprises an audible signal through the man-machine interface, as taught by Arent, thereby alerting the user to the security of a transaction to ease the user uncertainty, as discussed by Arent, (col. 1 lines 16-50).

Consider claim 30, Proust discloses the apparatus is capable of mobile telecommunication (see col. 1 lines 8-24 and col. 10 lines 21-67).

Consider claim 34, Proust discloses a method of operating a man-machine interface of a portable communication apparatus of the type having an operating system capable of executing a plurality of applications through the man-machine interface (see col. 1 lines 8-23, col. 1 lines 62-67, col. 2 lines 1-21, col. 5 lines 10-27, col. 10 lines 30-52, where Proust is discussing a mobile terminal with SIM card, the SIM having control of accessing data and applications, therefore, an operating system for the phone and using remote applications such as for payments.). Proust discloses providing a security-indicating feature (see col. 3 lines 54-67, col. 4 lines 1-30, col. 11 lines 13-34, and col. 13 lines 18-55, where Proust discusses access control policy indicators and authentication of applications attempting access data in the memories.). Proust discloses

providing an operating system call for invoking the security indicating feature from at least one of the plurality of applications (see col. 13 lines 18-55, col. 13 lines 65-67, and col. 14 lines 1-35 where Proust discusses the SIM module, i.e., the processors and algorithms, calling an authorization routine when a remote application try's to access data, where the SIM is the operating system of the phone). Proust discloses providing information regarding a security of one of the plurality of applications currently using the man-machine interface, upon reception of the operating system call from the one of the plurality of applications; and including the information in the security indicating feature (see col. 2 lines 49-55, col. 1 lines 48-67, col. 12 lines 1-30, col. 13 lines 18-55, col. 14 lines 4-35, and col. 14 lines 44-67, where Proust discusses authorizing remote applications including the standard cellular (GSM) applications for access to local stored data providing a report on authorization).

Proust does not specifically disclose providing a security-indicating feature in the man-machine interface. Arent teaches providing a security-indicating feature in the man-machine interface (see col. 4 lines 5-30 and col. 3 lines 5-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Proust, and provide a security indicating feature in the man-machine interface, as taught by Arent, allowing the user to be certain about the communication, as discussed by Arent, (col. 1 lines 17-35 ).

4. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Proust in view of Arent as applied to claim 22 above, and further in view of McNally et al. (6,384,850).

Consider claim 23, Proust discloses the portable communication device, as modified by Arent above, wherein the security indicator is a predetermined text message configurable by the



Art Unit: 2684

user, therefore, logically the font, size and color (see Arent col. 5 lines 10-67 and col. 7 lines 10-50).

Proust and Arent do not specifically disclose the predetermined text message has one of a font, size, and color different from other text messages presented on the display. McNally teaches the predetermined text message has one of a font, size, and color different from other text messages presented on the display (see col. 8 lines 65-67 and col. 9 lines 1-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Proust and Arent, and have the predetermined text message have one of a font, size, and color different from other text messages presented on the display, as taught by McNally , thus allowing the indicator to be presented in a readily comprehensible format, as discussed by McNally (col. 2 lines 63-67).

5. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Proust in view of Arent as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Pallas et al. (6,512,923).

Consider claim 29, Proust discloses the portable apparatus, as modified by Arent, wherein a connection is made to another device to use applications wherein a security indicator represents a secure connection, as discussed above. Arent further indicates the indicator could be from a variety of different indication means, visual, audio, text, or other (see col. 7 lines 11-50).

Proust and Arent do not specifically disclose the security indicator comprises a tactile signal through the man-machine interface. Pallas teaches the security indicator comprises a tactile signal through the man-machine interface (see col. 6 lines 11-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Proust and Arent, and have the security indicator comprises a tactile signal through

Art Unit: 2684

the man-machine interface, as taught by Pallas, thus allowing the user to be alerted of a security message at times when the user is not looking at the display so they can then look at the display and interpret the message, as discussed by Pallas, (col. 6 lines 8-11, col. 6 lines 13-20).

6. Claims 26, 31 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Proust in view of Arent as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Hamalainen et al. (6,249,584).

Consider claim 26, Proust and Arent discloses a security indicator (see col. 4 lines 10-16 and col. 13 lines 18-55).

Proust and Arent do not specifically disclose the security indicator comprises an indication of the type of connection between the portable communication apparatus and the remote device. Hamalainen teaches the security indicator comprises an indication of the type of connection between the portable communication apparatus and the remote device (see col. 3 lines 34-67, col. 4 lines 1-67, col. 5 lines 50-67, and col. 6 lines 1-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Proust and Arent, and have the security indicator comprises an indication of the type of connection between the portable communication apparatus and the remote device, as taught by Hamalainen, thereby allowing the user to know the status of the link, as discussed by Hamalainen, (col. 2 lines 30-40).

Consider claim 31, Proust and Arent disclose a security indicator (see col. 4 lines 10-16 and col. 13 lines 18-55).

Proust and Arent do not specifically disclose the security indicator comprises an indication of whether there is currently a link between the portable communication apparatus and

Art Unit: 2684

a remote device. Hamalainen teaches the security indicator comprises an indication of whether there is currently a link between the portable communication apparatus and a remote device. (see col. 3 lines 34-67, col. 4 lines 1-67, col. 5 lines 50-67, and col. 6 lines 1-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Proust and Arent, and have the security indicator comprises an indication of whether there is currently a link between the portable communication apparatus and a remote device, as taught by Hamalainen, thereby allowing the user to know the status of the link, as discussed by Hamalainen, (col. 2 lines 30-40).

Consider claim 33, Proust and Arent disclose a security indicator (see col. 4 lines 10-16 and col. 13 lines 18-55).

Proust and Arent do not specifically disclose the security indicator comprises an indication that a transaction over the secure connection cannot be interrupted, manipulated, or interpreted by an application other than the one of the first and second applications currently using the man-machine interface. Hamalainen teaches the security indicator comprises an indication that a transaction over the secure connection cannot be interrupted, manipulated, or interpreted by an application other than the one of the first and second applications currently using the man-machine interface (see col. 3 lines 34-67, col. 4 lines 1-67, col. 5 lines 50-67, and col. 6 lines 1-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Proust and Arent, and have the security indicator comprise an indication that a transaction over the secure connection cannot be interrupted, manipulated, or interpreted by an application other than the one of the first and second

Art Unit: 2684

applications currently using the man-machine interface, as taught by Hamalainen, thereby allowing the user to know the status of the link, as discussed by Hamalainen, (col. 2 lines 30-40).

7. Claim 27 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Proust in view of Arent and Hamalainen as applied to claim 26 above, and further in view of Heinonen et al. (6,418,326).

Consider claim 27, Proust discloses the portable apparatus, as modified by Arent, wherein a connection is made to another device to use applications, as discussed above.

Proust and Arent do not specifically disclose the connection is a short-range supplementary data connection. Heinonen teaches the connection is a short-range supplementary data connection (see col. 5 lines 42-53, where Heinonen is discussing a phone with another communication interface beside the phone interface for connecting to devices in close proximity such as a computer, therefore, a supplementary data connection). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Proust and Arent, and have the connection be a short-range supplementary data connection, as taught by Heinonen, thus allowing users normal phone usage and the ability to make transactions within a shop through close range, as discussed by Heinonen, (col. 3 lines 30-40).

8. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Proust in view of Arent as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Hall et al. (5,991,618), and Hamalainen et al. (6,249,584).

Consider claim 32, Proust discloses the portable apparatus, as modified by Arent above, wherein a connection is made to another device to use applications wherein a security indicator represents a secure connection, as discussed above. Arent further indicates the indicator could be

Art Unit: 2684

from a variety of different user indication means, visual, audio, text, or other (see col. 7 lines 10-50). Proust and Arent do not specifically disclose the security indicator comprises an indication of a physical link quality of the secure connection. Hamalainen discloses indicating a secure connection and a change in the secure connection (see col. 4 lines 8-67). Hall teaches an indication of a physical link quality of the secure connection (see col. 6 lines 35-61). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Proust and Arent, and have the security indicator comprises an indication of a physical link quality of the secure connection, as taught by Hamalainen and Hall, thus allowing the user to feel confident in the selected mode of operation so the user does not have to assume data is received via a good connection, as discussed by Hamalainen (col. 2 lines 30-40) and Hall, (col. 1 lines 35-52).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

9. Claims 24 and 25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Nick Corsaro at telephone number (703) 306-5616.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay Maung, can be reached at (703) 308-7745. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Application/Control Number: 09/676,800

Page 13

Art Unit: 2684

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth, Floor (Receptionist). Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Nick Corsaro

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Nick Corsaro". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a long horizontal stroke at the end.